

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/622,564	07/18/2003	Dennis Glen Hodgkinson	SWA4338P0180US	4820		
32116 759	90 09/07/2005	•	EXAM	EXAMINER		
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER			PRINCE, FRED G			
500 W. MADIS	ON STREET					
SUITE 3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO, IL 60661			1724			
•			DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/622,564	HODGKINSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Fred Prince	1724

= or or or unity or any appear zino.	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Fred Prince	1724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  1.  ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follows:	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff	ALLOWANCE. Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider	indonment of nce, which				
<ul> <li>places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>	otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply miner	compliance with 37 C	FR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	acausa				
<ul><li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li></ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	ccause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 1-15 under 35 USC 112, 1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph.							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).			ent canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro</li> </ol>	□ will not be entered, or b)              □ wi             vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a North date of the affidate of the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					
		Fred Prince					
		Primary Examiner					

8/29/05



Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejections under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) made by the examiner in the Office Action mailed August 30, 2004 still apply to claims 1-15 and therefore render claims 1-15 unpatentable. Applicant asserts that the instant invention does not include means for regulating pressure and therefore operates at atmospheric pressure. The examiner disagrees as 1) applicant makes no explicit disclosure as to the pressure that the process is carried out and therefore the record does not show how applicant is able to carry out the process such that the pressure is exactly 14.7 psia (atmospheric pressure), and 2) blowers and gas collectors indeed are known in the art to be capable of regulating pressure of a reactor depending on the manner and/or frequency in which they are operated. As applicant does not disclose the manner in which the blower and/or gas collector is operated to establish and maintain a pressure of 14.7 psia, the argument is not persuasive. The examiner agrees that Ainsworth et al. appears to require pressure above atmospheric pressure for proper operation. However, as applicant does not claim and, in the examiner's opinion, cannot claim a pressure of 14.7 psia (atmospheric pressure) based on applicant's orginal disclosure, applicant's claims are not patentable over the prior art of record.